PATENT

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office action dated 11/29/2005 is respectfully requested under the provisions of 37 CFR §1.111(b).

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowability of claims 46-48.

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11 - 13, 15-20, 22, 23, 25-27, 29-34, 36, 37, 39-41, 46-51 are pending.

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11 - 13, 15-20, 22, 23, 25-27, 29-34, 36, 37, 39-41, 49-51 stand as rejected.

Claims 46-48 have been objected to as depending on a rejected claim.

Claims 7, 10, 14, 21, 24, 28, 35, 38 and 42 have been previously canceled or withdrawn.

No claims are amended by this office action reply and request for continued examination..

I. Comments to Examiner's Response to Arguments

Applicant respectfully re-asserts that Zucher column 3 fails to teach "comparing the address format of the destination address to acceptable address formats defined by the applications". Zucher teaches that the "recipient" is an attribute at column 4, lines 34-35. Zucher also teaches that "rules" are applied to the attribute to determine if a message is delivered to an application (column 3, lines 25-27). However, Zucher does not teach that the format of the destination address is compared to acceptable address formats defined by the applications. Further, Zucher's applications teach the message manager program to accept a registration from a message client program where the registration comprises at least one rule and at least one message attribute to which the rule is to be applied (column 8, lines 56-66). That is, Zucher must register both the rule and the message attribute. In the instant invention, only formats of acceptable address formats are maintained by the

PATENT

application registry. When a message is received, the format of the destination address of the message is compared to the address formats in the application registry to select the application used to processes the message (Figs. 13-20, and text at pg. 38, ln. 5 through pg. 40, ln. 15.)

II. Rejections under 35 USC § 102(e)

Claims 1-3, 8, 11, 15-17, 22, 25, 29-31, 36, 39, and 43-45 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Zurcher et al. (6,425,002). This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the following arguments.

Anticipation requires a single reference that teaches or enables each of the claimed elements (arranged as in the claim) expressly or inherently as interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art.

Previously presented claim 1 is directed to a computerized method of operating an e-mail-invoked application server. The claimed method includes

- receiving an incoming e-mail message from a sender utilizing a network, wherein the incoming e-mail includes content and a destination address having an address format;

- determining which application of a plurality of applications available on the e-mail-invoked application server will accept the incoming e-mail for processing by comparing the address format of the destination address to acceptable address formats defined by the applications;

- refusing the incoming e-mail when it is determined that no application will accept the incoming e-mail for processing; and

- invoking at least one of the plurality of applications to process the content of the incoming e-mail when it is determined that the address format of the destination address is one of the acceptable address formats defined by the at least one application.

PATENT

Paragraphs 5, 6, and 10 of the office action asserts that Zurcher teaches "determining which application of a plurality of applications available on the e-mail server will accept the incoming e-mail for processing by comparing message attributes (column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 29, i.e. 'determining whether the inbound message is to be delivered to one application or the other application or both applications')."

Zucher fails to teach "comparing the address format of the destination address to acceptable address formats defined by the applications". Zucher teaches that the "recipient" is an attribute at Z: column 4, lines 34-35. Zucher also teaches that "rules" are applied to the attribute to determine if a message is delivered to an application (Z: column 3, lines 25-27). However, Zucher does not teach that the format of the destination address is compared to acceptable address formats defined by the applications. Further, Zucher's applications teach the message manager program to accept a registration from a message client program where the registration comprises at least one rule and at least one message attribute to which the rule is to be applied (Z: column 8, lines 56-66). That is, Zucher must register both the rule and the message attribute.

In the instant invention, only formats of acceptable address formats are maintained by the application registry. When a message is received, the format of the destination address of the message is compared to the address formats in the application registry to select the application used to processes the message (Figs. 13-20, and text at page 38, line. 5 through page 40, line 15.)

Nothing in Zurcher teaches "comparing the address format of the destination address to acceptable address formats defined by the applications". Thus Zucher cannot anticipate previously amended **claim 1** and applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Previously presented **claims 15 and 29** are similarly not anticipated. Thus, applicant respectfully traverses the 102(e) rejection of these claims.

Claims 2, 3, 8, 11, 16, 17, 22, 25, 30, 31, 36, 39, and 43-45 depend on and further limit their respective previously presented claims 1, 15 and 29. Thus, **claims 2, 3, 8, 11,**

PATENT

16, 17, 22, 25, 30, 31, 36, 39, and 43-45 are not anticipated and applicant respectfully traverses the 102(e) rejection of these claims.

In addition, with respect to paragraph 13 (claims 8, 22 and 36) of the office action, Nothing in Zurcher teaches an event to advance the processing of a task. See, for example, page 2, lines 20-24, page 22, lines 25-29, page 26, line 2, page 36, line 20, page 36, lines 20-25, and page 37, lines 26-29. The Zurcher cite simply provides examples of message clients that can perform operations without necessarily invoking an application. Nothing in the cited text teaches events as used in the instant application.

III. Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 4-6, 9, 18-20, 23, 32-34, 37 and 49-51 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Zurcher in view U.S. Patent No. 6,775,689 to Raghynandan.

Claims 12, 13, 26, 27, 40 and 41 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Zurcher in view U.S. Patent No. 6,443,546 to Biliris.

These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the following arguments.

A prima facie case of obviousness is established by one or more references that were available to the inventor and that teach a suggestion to combine or modify the reference, the combination or modification of which would appear to be sufficient to have made the claimed invention obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art.

B. Cited Art

The Biliris Reference

Biliris teaches a messaging system that includes a plurality of messaging entities, such as messages, folders and users, a plurality of attributes associated with the messaging entities, and a plurality of applications. A core messaging infrastructure stores and manages messaging attributes. (Biliris, Abstract.) Each application is operable to examine and modify at least some of the messaging entities and attributes. An application selection device is operable to select an application to be invoked based on

PATENT

values of the examined messaging entities and attributes. An application invocation device invokes the selected application. (Biliris, col. 1, lines 52 – 60.)

Biliris explicitly teaches that applications are selectively invoked based on the state of the messaging system, which is defined as the set of values of all the entities and attributes in the messaging system. (Biliris, col. 7, lines 10 – 16.) Thus, Biliris does not appear to teach determining which application of a plurality of applications available on the e-mail-invoked application server will accept the incoming e-mail for processing by comparing the address format of the destination address of the incoming e-mail to a plurality of acceptable address formats defined by the applications, and invoking an application when the address format of the destination address is determined to be one of the acceptable address formats defined by at least one application.

The Raghunandan Reference

Raghunandan teaches a method, apparatus and program product for restructuring email messages for transmission to a plurality of recipients by providing transmission control directives and email content segment identifiers, supplied by the user, parsing the directives and email contents, expanding aliases wherever necessary and applying the directives to restructure the email contents by sending selected segments to selected recipients. (Raghunandan, Abstract.)

The email system receives the email message from the user, including identified segments in the email contents as well as transmission control directives in the email header, which define identified recipients for each identified segment. The email system parses the message to identify each segment as well as the list of recipients for each segment. The email system then constructs customized email messages for each list of recipients, in accordance with the transmission control directives by excluding those segments which the recipients are not required to receive. The messages are then transmitted to each of the recipients in each of the lists. (Raghunandan, col. 6, lines 37 – 51, Figs. 1 and 4.)

The Raghunandan reference provides several examples of the features of the technique for restructuring email messages. In the discussion of the implementation

PATENT

details of these examples, Raghunandan discloses how to modify the algorithms of an existing email system to implement the new techniques. These details include the inclusion of new fields in the e-mail header structure for identifying recipient lists for each segment in the email content, and new fields in the e-mail body structure to associate text or attachments with each segment. (Raghunandan, col. 8, lines 50 – 60.) In a second example, changes are required to the To:, CC:, Bcc: and Group: value types to include segment order separated by commas, in order to select more appropriate recipients who are part of a complex alias hierarchy . (Raghunandan, col. 10, lines 4 – 7 and 53 – 57.)

It appears that the teachings in the Raghunandan reference have no direct relevance to the limitations in previously presented independent claim 1. Raghunandan does not appear to teach determining which application of a plurality of applications available on the e-mail-invoked application server will accept an incoming e-mail for processing by comparing the address format of the destination address of the incoming e-mail to a plurality of acceptable address formats defined by the applications, and invoking an application when the address format of the destination address is determined to be one of the acceptable address formats defined by at least one application.

Nothing in Raghunandan suggests the limitations of previously amended claims 1, 15, and 29. Nothing in Biliris suggests the limitations of previously amended claims 1, 15, and 29.

For the foregoing reasons, is believed that independent previously presented claims 1, 15 and 29 are patentably distinct over and are not obvious in view of the Biliris and Raghunandan disclosures, and are believed to be in condition for allowance. Insofar as claims 4-6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 18-20, 23, 26, 27, 32-34, 37, 40, 41 and 49 – 51 are concerned, these claims include the limitations of and depend from now presumably allowable claims 1, 15 and 29 and so are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Since all rejections, objections and requirements contained in the outstanding official action have been fully answered or traversed and shown to be inapplicable to the present claims, it is respectfully submitted that reconsideration is now in order under the

PATENT

provisions of 37 CFR §1.111(b) and such reconsideration is respectfully requested. Upon reconsideration, it is also respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is therefore respectfully requested.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment. However, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025. This also constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and authorization to charge all fees therefor to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

Should any additional issues remain, or if I can be of any additional assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me at (650) 812-4259.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel B. Curtis #39159/

DANIEL B. CURTIS
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 39,159
(650) 812-4259
dbcurtis@parc.com